

REMARKS

The above amendments are submitted along with the following remarks to be fully responsive to the Official Action mailed August 2, 2006. It is further submitted that this response is timely filed within the shortened-statutory period as extended by the one month request for extension of time filed concurrently herewith. Reconsideration of all outstanding grounds of rejection and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, dependent claims 2 and 9, claims 12-20 and withdrawn claims 21-29 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Thus, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-8, 10 and 11 are presently pending. It is submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons set out below.

Claim 1 is rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by the Kamikawa et al reference. However, original dependent claim 2 is not rejected by the Kamikawa et al reference under the 102(b) rejection or any 103 rejection including the Kamikawa et al reference. By this amendment, claim 1 now incorporates the subject matter of dependent claim 2 that the delivery of cleaning enhancement substance is varied by changing flow rate in stages from a first to second predetermined flow rate. Support for this limitation can be found at least in the subject specification on page 27, lines 2-17. As accepted by the Examiner, the Kamikawa et al reference teaches changing the concentration of IPA delivery during certain embodiments as in column 18, lines 14-55. Kamikawa et al specifically teach changing concentration as controlled by a generator (see Fig. 7) including as factors the supply of liquid IPA to the generator and the heat created by a heater 105 as connected to a power unit. The Kamikawa et al reference does not describe or suggest varying flow rate of delivery of IPA, nor does it disclose or suggest changing delivery in stages from a first predetermined flow rate to a second predetermined flow rate. Allowance of independent claim 1 over the Kamikawa et al reference is believed proper and respectfully requested.

Claim 1 and dependent claim 2 were rejected under the Christensen et al reference under 102(e). In particular, the Examiner points to paragraph 50 of the Christensen et al publication as suggesting varying of flow rates of delivered cleaning enhancement substance (IPA). Admittedly, paragraph 50 describes both flow of rinse liquid within a cascade rinser and flow rate of delivered gas (cleaning enhancement substance and carrier gas) as affecting the formed meniscus as the potential for turbulence at the meniscus. It is stated that "the geometry and

placement of orifices 61 on each nozzle 20, the position of each nozzle 20 with respect to the meniscus, and flow rate of the cleaning enhancement substance may desirably be adjusted to eliminate turbulence" at the formed meniscus. This statement is made with respect to how to set up desired flow parameters for a rinsing and cleaning process, as may be done by computer modeling or empirically, so that a process can be conducted according to these determined parameters to minimize turbulence at the meniscus. This is not a suggestion that a process include delivery of cleaning enhancement substance including multiple stages with different flow rates. The Christensen et al reference teaches how to set up a process with an understanding of minimizing turbulence at a meniscus, not to vary delivery rate during such a process. Presently amended claim 1 is patentably distinct over the Christensen et al reference not only on the basis of delivering cleaning enhancement substance as such is varied, but also in that claim 1 recites delivery in stages from first to second predetermined flow rates. Allowance of claim 1 over the Christensen et al reference is also believed proper and respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that presently pending claims 1, 3-8, 10 and 11 are currently in condition for allowance, a notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner finds any issue remaining after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, at the Examiner's convenience, in order to expedite any remaining prosecution.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2006

By:



Mark W. Binder, Reg. No. 32,642

Customer Number 33072

Phone: 651-275-9805

Facsimile: (651) 351-2954